

## REMARKS

Claims 1-13 of the subject application are currently pending and have been rejected by the Examiner. In the accompanying amendment, the Applicants have amended claims 1-13, and have added new claims 14, and 15. Support for the amendments to the claims may be found in the written description, drawings, and claims of the subject application as originally filed. On account of the foregoing listed support for the amendments to the claims, it is respectfully submitted that the amendments do not add new matter.

### Drawings

The Examiner has objected to Figures 1-3 for failing to bear a suitable legend such as "prior art". In response, the Applicants have amended Figures 1 and 2 to clearly indicate that the matter shown therein is "prior art". However, the Applicants respectfully point out to the Examiner that the material shown in the Figure 3 of the drawings is not "prior art" as can be seen from paragraph 21 of the written description. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the objection to Figure 3.

Further, the Examiner objected to Figures 7-8, and 11, because the cross-hatching does not indicate the material correctly. In the response, the Applicants have amended Figures 7-8, and 11, so that the cross-hatching clearly indicates the material correctly. In view of the amendments to Figures 7-8, and 11, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw his rejection of these drawings.

Regarding Figure 8, the Examiner has stated that:

"Figure 8 seems to be showing vertical and horizontal movement, but how can there be movement along 813 since the sides of 802 are flush with 816? Maybe Figure 6 is showing vertical and horizontal movements; can't 602A move in a direction between 612 and 613? See 112 rejection below".

Regarding Figure 8, although it can not be seen in the drawing, there is a gap 812 between the conductive foot 802 and the retainer ring 816 as is explained in paragraph 32 of the written description. The gap 814 provides space for horizontal range of motion, while the spring extension 803 provides space for the required vertical range of motion by pushing the bolt head 801 into the device. Thus, because of the gap 814, it is possible to have movement along 813.

### Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claims 9, and 10 because of minor informalities therein. In response, the Applicants have amended claim 9 and have cancelled claim 10.. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner should withdraw the objection to claims 9 and 10.

### Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 112

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-9, and 11-12 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. Particular, the Examiner has stated that:

“In claim 1, it’s not clear that the “apparatus” is being positively recited. Is the Applicant also claiming the “replacement unit”? The Examiner will interpret the preamble to read “apparatus assembly”.

Claim 1 has been deleted in the accompanying amendment. New claim 14 which is based on claim 1 positively recites the apparatus and instead of a “replacement unit” now has a “replaceable unit”, which is positively claimed. Based on the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection of claim 1. Given the above, and given that claim 2-9 depend on claim 14, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner should withdraw the rejection to claims 1-9.

Regarding claims 11 and 12, the Examiner has stated that “it is not clear what direction vertical and horizontal are? to what they are referenced? isn’t the vertical direction the same as perpendicular”. In response, the Applicant has amended claim 11 and has deleted claim 12. Amended claim 11 does not include the limitation of movement in a “vertical” direction. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection to claims 11 and 12.

#### Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-2, and 8 under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lee (US 5,502,366). Applicants traverse.

Claim 14 as amended includes the following limitations:

a body defining a housing for an electronic component; and  
a replaceable unit having an inner surface bearing first electrical contacts to electrically couple the replacement unit to the electronic component within the housing, and an outer surface which is opposed to the inner surface, the outer surface bearing second electrical contacts which are integrated therewith, the second electrical contacts being to provide power to a separate electronic device coupled thereto.

(Amended claim 14) (Emphasis added)

Lee discloses a mobile electronic apparatus 30 which includes a removable battery 40. The battery includes contacts 43 and 44, which mate with corresponding contacts 33 and 34 of the electronic apparatus 30. However, Lee fails to teach or suggest that the battery has an outer surface which is opposed to an inner surface, the outer surface bearing second electrical contact which are integrated therewith, the second electrical contacts being to provide power to a separate electronic device coupled thereto, as recited in claim 14.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Lee does not anticipate claim 14. Given that claims 2-9 depend on claim 14, it is respectfully submitted that these claims

are also not anticipated by Lee. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection of claims 1-2, and 8 based on Lee.

Regarding claims 10, 11, and 13, the Examiner rejected these claims under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Siwiak (US 4,578,628). Applicants traverse.

Claim 15 includes the following limitations:

a body defining a housing for an electronic component, the body having at least one external electrical contact on an operatively upper side to provide power to a separate electronic device, and at least one spring-loaded contact on an operatively under side to engage with a separate pad and to draw power therefrom.

(Claim 15) (Emphasis added)

Siwiak discloses a portable battery which includes electrical contacts 18 which engage with corresponding electrical contacts 16 of an electrical apparatus. However, Siwiak fails to teach or suggest the above-emphasized limitations of claim 10. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Siwiak does not anticipate claim 10. Given that claims 11 and 13 depend on claim 10, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also not anticipated by Siwiak. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection of claims 10, 11 and 13.


It is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, all rejections have been overcome. All pending claims are now in condition for allowance, which is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner determines that prompt allowance of these claims could be facilitated by telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact John P. Ward at (408) 720-8300.

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due. Furthermore, if an extension is required, then Applicants hereby request such an extension.

Respectfully submitted,  
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Dated: February 28, 2005

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Van N. Nguy  
Reg. No. 55,851

Customer No. 008791  
12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030  
(408) 720-8300

## AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

In the accompanying Replacement Sheets, Figures 1 and 2 have been amended to add the legend "Prior Art". In Figure 7, the cross-hatching for the part 710 has been amended to show that part 710 is of an insulating material. In Figure 8, the cross-hatching for the part 810 has been amended to show that part 810 is of an insulating material. In Figure 11, the cross-hatching for the parts 1101 and 1102 have been amended to show that parts 1101 and 1102 are of an insulating material.